

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

AMEC ENVIRONMENT &  
INFRASTRUCTURE, INC.,  
a Nevada corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIV 14-0279 MCA/KBM

THOMAS TANGEN, an individual,

Defendant.

**ORDER ON MOTION TO STAY DISCOVERY**

**THIS MATTER** comes before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Stay Discovery (*Doc. 19*), filed January 26, 2015 and fully briefed on March 2, 2015. Having reviewed the submissions of the parties and the relevant authorities, the Court finds that Defendant's Motion to Stay is well-taken and will be **granted**.

Defendant moves the Court to stay discovery in this case pending completion of a two-week jury trial in Colorado state court ("Colorado trial"), which began on March 2, 2015. Defendant notes, and Plaintiff does not dispute, that the Colorado trial involves four causes of action that are essentially identical to the four claims at issue in the case before this Court.

Exercising the broad discretion incident to its inherent power to control its own docket, *see Clinton v. Jones*, 520 U.S. 681, 706 (1997), the Court concludes that the proposed two-week discovery stay is appropriate. The Court agrees with Defendant that a stay of discovery in this case during the pendency of the related

Colorado trial comports with common sense. Moreover, such a limited stay poses little prejudice to Plaintiff and will, in fact, allow both parties and their legal teams to focus their efforts on the on-going jury trial, perhaps even streamlining discovery in this case once it commences.

Although the Court has briefly reviewed the parties' memoranda submitted in support and in opposition to the motion, these practical considerations warrant a decision without addressing the various arguments and case law contained therein or providing a comprehensive memorandum opinion. Indeed, it would unnecessarily consume judicial resources over the next week and a half to do so, with the Court's decision essentially rendered moot by the conclusion of the Colorado trial. In the event that Defendant requests an extension of the discovery stay imposed herein, however, the Court will more thoroughly address the factors and considerations related to such a stay. But under the present circumstances, the Court finds the proposed limited stay of discovery to be warranted as a matter of efficiency and preservation of resources.

**Wherefore,**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Stay (*Doc. 19*) is granted.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that discovery in this matter is stayed pending conclusion of the jury trial on related claims currently underway in Colorado state court.

  
UNITED STATES CHIEF MAGISTRATE JUDGE